



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,423	07/09/2004	Richard Heller	1372.32.UTLCPDV2	5054
21901	7590	11/04/2008		
SMITH HOPEN, PA 180 PINE AVENUE NORTH OLDSMAR, FL 34677			EXAMINER WITCZAK, CATHERINE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3767	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/710,423

Applicant(s)

HELLER ET AL.

Examiner

CATHERINE N. WITCZAK

Art Unit

3767

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers et al (US 6,623,454) as modified by Eggers et al.

Eggers et al disclose in Figure 19 a device comprising an elongated member comprising a cylindrical core electrode (118) surrounded by a first nonconductive insulator sleeve (108); a first electrode, and a second nonconductive insulator sleeve being in independent circuit communication with a respective portion of a source of electrical energy, the electrodes being fully capable of being able to establish an electromagnetic field in vivo to cause electromigration of molecules and transient permeability of cell membranes; and the device further having a portal (132) through which a substance may be passed.

Eggers et al disclose the claimed invention except for expressly disclosing a second electrode member and a third nonconductive insulator sleeve. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add an additional electrode and insulating layer because Applicant has not disclosed that having three electrodes and three insulating sleeves as opposed to two provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Eggers et al with an additional electrode and insulating layer to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 12.

2. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers et al as modified by Hofmann et al (US Patent No. 6233482B1). Now even though Eggers et al do not explicitly disclose a plurality of members configurable to surround a periphery of a tissue or provide opposite-polarity voltages or active a plurality of electrodes in a predetermined pattern, attention is directed to Hofmann. The Hofmann reference teaches the use of a plurality of electroporation members to surround tissues, utilize opposite-polarity voltages, and activate electrodes in a predetermined pattern, see figures 2A-G, 6, & 7A-D, col. 3 line 62 - col. 8 line 36. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Eggers et al with the teachings of Hofmann in order to provide electroporation therapy to a larger area as well as customizing the therapy to different tissues and operations.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/22/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that it is not an obvious matter of design choice to add an additional electrode and insulating layer. Examiner disagrees for the following reasons. Firstly, it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8. Secondly, Applicants themselves have stated that "it can be appreciated by one of skill in the art that any number of electrodes and insulators could be successively configured in overlapping fashion to produce a multielectrode member tailored to a particular application ..." in paragraph [0038] of the specification. For these reasons Examiner maintains her position that it would be an obvious matter of design choice to add an electrode/insulating layer.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CATHERINE N. WITCZAK whose telephone number is (571)272-7179. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Simons can be reached on (571) 272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 3767

/Catherine N Witczak/

Examiner, Art Unit 3767

/Kevin C. Simons/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3767